



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

istence. When in Columbia, South Carolina, to examine the State records, the reviewer noted several interesting facts connected with this tribe, particularly that in 1714 a Yuchi town called "Chestowee" or "Ches-toowa" was "cut off" by the Cherokee at the instigation of some English traders. Possibly the people of this town spoke the second dialect to which Dr Speck refers in the paper under discussion. Another name given the Yuchi by the English was "Round town people."

All that need be said in conclusion is that at last we have an authoritative monograph on the Yuchi and that the University of Pennsylvania is to be congratulated on having its new series of anthropological publications open with the filling in of a serious gap in the ethnology of North America in such a thorough manner.

JOHN R. SWANTON.

The Origins of Leadership. A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Literature in Candidacy for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Department of Sociology). By EBEN MUMFORD. University of Chicago Press, 1909. 87 pp. (Price 54 cents.)

This short paper is one of the many signs of an increasing tendency on the part of students of sociology among well-developed races to make use of anthropological data derived from primitive tribes, and it must be approached critically with the understanding that it claims merely to be a trail blazer. This working of sociology back into the field of primitive anthropology might have been anticipated, and was bound to come when the question of origins was entered upon. Up to the present time writers on the sociology of lower races, such as McLennan, Frazer, Westermarck, and Morgan, have been regarded rather as anthropologists than sociologists, but the partition of the sociology of primitive races from that of the advanced nations of our day is very artificial, and as time goes on there will be an increasing tendency to break it down.

Starting as he does from the point of view of the sociologist, as ordinarily defined, Dr Mumford leads up to his subject by a discussion of general basal principles couched in the technical language of psychology and sociology. It is only in the latter part of his paper that the anthropological element becomes strong and that the anthropologist feels able to form a due estimate of the value of his work. The study is divided as follows:

I. *Introduction.* — The Relation of the Function of Leadership to the Science of Sociology. — Leadership as a Universal Function of Association. — Relation of Leadership to the Social Process.

II. *Leadership as an Innate and Acquired Model Societary Tendency or Force.*

III. *Relation of Leadership to the Organized and Organizing Phases of the Social Process, or to the Habitual-tensional-adaptive Phases of Associating* [general considerations]. — Leadership and Occupations. — Leadership, Occupations, and Institutions in Relation to the Problems and Crises arising in the Expression of Social Impulses and Interests.

IV. *Leadership and Social Structures and Functions from the Genetic Point of View.* — Hunting People.

V. *Evolution of Leadership in the Prematernal Stage of Association.*

VI. *Evolution of Leadership and Institutions in the Matriarchal and Patriarchal Stages of Social Organization.* — Leadership in Relation to Customs and Institutions from the Point of View of Myths and Traditions. — The Native Tribes of Australia. — Leadership among the Native Hunting Tribes of America.

VII. *Conclusion.*

These subjects thus fall into two main classes, first the place and importance of leadership in the science of sociology, and secondly the different phases which it presents among peoples in the hunting stage, the last being considered evolutionally. It is unfortunate, in the present state of anthropological information, and yet natural, that the evolutionary side of the question should have been given the prominent position it here occupies, not but that leadership evolutionally considered is a legitimate subject of discussion, but because it was infallible that Australian and American systems should be dragged together and assigned to different strata in the series of human development. It was infallible because the chief authorities to whom Dr Mumford could appeal have done the same thing, whereas it is entirely too early to attempt an assignment of the respective positions of Australian and American organizations in the world-wide course of human development. This should by no means be attempted until American, African, and Asiatic social systems are much better understood. Dr Mumford has been fortunate, however, in using Professor Thomas as a guide, and therefore postulating a prematernal stage of association, and he has followed a true instinct in not differentiating between the matriarchal and patriarchal stages of society, though he falls into the common error of assuming two such successive stages.

The most serious criticism to be made of this work is the apparently meager list of authorities consulted. The principles discussed in the early sections are so general and supposedly deal with such well established axioms of sociology that few references might naturally be required, but

Bancroft, Schoolcraft, Krause, J. O. Dorsey, and McGee form a rather limited ethnological foundation for the discussion of American social organizations, although excellent so far as they go. The pioneer character of the work from a sociological point of view may, however, be pleaded as an excuse for no more extended consultation of authorities, and in this capacity we cordially welcome it, foreseeing that trained sociological minds once acclimated to the anthropological field will be able to throw new light on the problems often confounding professional anthropologists.

JOHN R. SWANTON.

Nouvelles recherches sur la formation pampéenne et l'homme fossile de la République Argentine, recueil d'observations scientifiques . . . publié par
ROBERT LEHMANN-NITSCHÉ.

It seems a curious coincidence that about the same time Dr Aleš Hrdlička published his excellent "Skeletal Remains Suggesting or Attributed to Early Man in North America (*Bulletin 33, Bur. Am. Eth.*)", Professor Lehmann-Nitsche at La Plata edited a work similar in purport relating to the antiquity of man in South America. What Professor W. H. Holmes has said in the prefatory note to Hrdlička's treatise applies equally to South America: "In the earlier years of the investigations there existed a rather marked tendency on the part of students, and especially on the part of amateurs and the general public, hastily to accept any testimony that seemed to favor antiquity." With this in view Lehmann-Nitsche endeavored to determine the real scientific value of all known fossil human remains found in Argentina. The results of this painstaking research, extending over nearly ten years, though often interrupted, are embodied in these *Nouvelles recherches*, published in tomo XIV (Segunda serie, t. 1) of the *Revista del Museo de La Plata*, Buenos Aires, 1907. Although Lehmann-Nitsche's work is much larger in size, and perhaps more exhaustive than Hrdlička's, it should be borne in mind that the former had the aid of no fewer than ten specialists, including geologists and paleontologists of note, as follows, in alphabetical order: Burckhardt, Doering, Frueh, von Ihering, Leboucq, R. Martin, Santiago Roth, W. B. Scott, Steinmann, and Zirkel.

To write a review, in a few pages, of a work of this size (about 350 pages, royal octavo), abounding in minute technical descriptions and extended dissertations, is impossible. I shall therefore merely draw the attention of North American anthropologists to Professor Lehmann-Nitsche's researches by means of a brief summary.

The *Nouvelles recherches* consists of two parts — one geological, the